

REMARKS

This Amendment is prepared in response to the second, non-final Office action mailed on 14 April 2009 (Paper No. 20090312). Claims 1, 3-13 and 21-23 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-11, 21 and 22 by this amendment.

Drawings

On Page 2 of Paper No. 20090312, the Examiner has objected to the Drawings because of an allegation that the limitation “a data line arranged on a same layer as the source and drain electrodes” of claim 6 is not illustrated. Applicant has amended claim 6 by this amendment to strike out this controversial language.

Prior Art Rejections

On Page 3 of Paper No. 20090312, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nozawa *et al.* (JP2003-15548). Applicant has amended each of independent claims 1 and 10 making this rejection moot.

On Page 7 of Paper No. 20090312, the Examiner has rejected claims 4-5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozawa in view of Koyama (US 2003/0117083). Applicant has amended independent claim 6 making the rejection of claims in rejection of claims 7-9 moot. Applicant has amended independent claim 1 by this amendment making the rejection of claims 4-5 moot.

On Page 8 of Paper No. 20090312, the Examiner has rejected claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozawa in view of Komiya (US 6,724,149). Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 6 and 10 along with depending claims 21 and 22 making this rejection moot.

Comments on Claim Amendments

Applicant has amended claim 1 to claim that the power supply line is arranged on a different layer than the data line **and** that the power supply line is arranged on a different layer than the gate line to distinguish from the Examiner's rejection at the bottom of Page 3 of Paper No. 20090312 and to further distinguish from the applied prior art.

Applicant has amended each of claims 6 and 10 to claim Applicant's layered structure to further distinguish Applicant's invention from that of the applied prior art and to emphasize that an insulating layer (i.e., passivation film) is arranged between the power supply lines and each of the gate and data lines. None of the applied prior art references, taken singly or in combination, fairly teaches or suggests this.

Applicant has amended claims 11, 21 and 22 to claim that an entirety of the power supply layer is separated from an entirety of each of the data lines and gate lines by an insulating film (i.e., the passivation film). None of the applied prior art references, taken singly or in combination, fairly teaches this.

Entry of and favorable examination are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are patentable over the cited references, taken either alone or combination and accordingly should now be in a conditions suitable for allowance.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert E. Bushnell/
Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

Customer Number 08439
2029 "K" Street N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56937
Date: 7/14/09
I.D.: REB/ML